



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,647	06/16/2000	Alexander E. Mallet	MS150658.1	2603
27195	7590	03/25/2005	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114				BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				2195

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4/1

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/595,647	MALLET ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-19, 21, 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WRIGHT (U.S. Patent 5,857,201).

As to claim 1, WRIGHT teaches a system for parallel asynchronous command execution, comprising: a first computer system (server / client) for directing a call to invoke a remote procedure (task / method / authenticate) in a second computer system (client / server) (see fig. 4a; fig. 4b), the first computer and second computer communicating via a non-persistent connection (col. 5, lines 46-54; col. 6, lines 46-56); wherein the second computer system (client / server) performs remote execution of the remote procedure (task / method / authentication) and upon completion of the remote procedure generates an event trigger (event) and transmits the event trigger (event) and remote procedure results (results / returned data) to the first computer system (server / client) (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19); wherein the first computer system (server / client) carries out other procedures (other tasks) while waiting for the event trigger (event) and remote procedure results (results / returned data) from the second computer system (client / server) (col. 6, lines 54-62; “Each “session” encompasses connecting the remote host, performing a specific task

or set of tasks, and then disconnecting from the host. Because the connection times must be short, the FL client and FL server need to be able to perform the required tasks without user intervention. This is very different from a persistent connection based client/server model where the connection exists the entire time the application is used, and data is only retrieved when the user requests it.”) In addition, Wright teaches the there exists a plurality of session connections between the client and server systems wherein each connection is independent and concurrent with one another to request and perform a plurality of tasks (col. 7, lines 1-65). Therefore, it is inherent within the teachings of WRIGHT that the client or server makes additional request to the other by using other connections before, during and after initial requests are sent since the connections are used to request and process task concurrently.

As to claims 17, 23-25, and 27, refer to claim 1 for rejection.

As to claim 18, reference is made to a method that corresponds to the system of claim 1 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claims 28 and 29, reference is made to a computer-readable medium that corresponds to the system of claim 1 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claims 2 and 19, WRIGHT teaches distributed object architecture (via connection objects, agent objects / master service object) for communicating between the first computer system and the second computer system (col. 7, lines 11-65).

As to claims 4, 21, 26 and 30, WRIGHT teaches the first computer system configures an event to receive the remote procedure results from the second computer system (col. 8, lines 13-16; “Some methods such as of the remote database APIs have corresponding events that are triggered by the messages from the client indicating the results of the actions invoked by the method.”).

As to claim 6, WRIGHT teaches the event is provided with an identifier (error / record to send) for enabling the second computer system to notify the first computer system (via the event having an error code or indicating the record to send to the client) (col. 9, lines 15-50).

As to claim 8, WRIGHT teaches a completion event (event) on the second computer system for notifying the first computer system (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

As to claim 9, WRIGHT teaches an object interface (APIs) for providing remote access between the first computer system and the second computer system (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19)

As to claim 10, WRIGHT teaches the object interface includes an identification (client agent ID) for a remote object (agent objects) (via messaging API) (col. 9, lines 15 – 50).

As to claim 11, WRIGHT teaches the object interface (APIs) includes a computer name (username) for identifying where to trigger (send and handle) an event (event) (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

As to claim 12, WRIGHT teaches the object interface (APIs) includes an identification for an event for the second computer system to trigger (via the event being received by requesting computer) (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

As to claim 13, WRIGHT teaches the object interface (APIs) includes an input argument (parameters) for providing results from the remote procedure (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

As to claim 14, WRIGHT teaches the object interface (APIs) includes at least one of a username (username), domain, and password (password) for specifying a user context for the remote procedure (via establishing a session) (col. 10, line 66 – col. 11, line 21).

As to claim 15, WRIGHT teaches the second computer system comprises a work interface (API / functions) for executing the remote procedure (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

As to claim 16, WRIGHT teaches the work interface (API / functions) comprises an input argument and an output argument (parameters) (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 5, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WRIGHT (U.S. Patent 5,857,201).

As to claim 3, WRIGHT substantially discloses the invention as disclosed above. However, WRIGHT does not teach that the object architecture is a COM, DCOM and Corba implementation. “Official Notice” is taken in that it is well known in the art that COM, DCOM, and Corba are well known remote procedure calling mechanism in an

distributed object architecture that execute above the network protocol and wherein the objects are able to communicate with other objects through object interfaces and by embedding various information, i.e. a remote object identifier, a computer name identifier, arguments, and a user name, into a remote procedure call embedded into a network packet. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of WRIGHT with the well-known remote procedure calling mechanism of COM, DCOM, and Corba in order to perform object communication in a mobile network environment wherein the connection is non-persistent.

As to claim 20, reference is made to a method that corresponds to the system of claim 3 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 3 above.

As to claim 5, "Official Notice" is taken in that Windows Management Infrastructure events are well known message events and therefore would be obvious to one skilled in the art to use the particular type of event in the system of WRIGHT in order to handle a response.

As to claim 22, reference is made to a method that corresponds to the system of claim 5 and is therefore met by the rejection of claim 5 above.

5. Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WRIGHT (U.S. Patent 5,857,201) in view of AZAGURY (U.S. patent 6,529,962).

As to claim 7, WRIGHT teaches a work item (procedure call / task) (col. 8, line 20 – col. 10, line 19; in particular col. 10, line 54 – col. 12, line 19) and there exists a plurality of session connections between the client and server systems wherein each connection is independent and concurrent with one another to request and perform a plurality of tasks (col. 7, lines 1-65). However, WRIGHT does not explicitly teach a thread for processing the remote procedure.

AZAGURY teaches a thread for processing a remote procedure (remote thread processes remote method invocation call) (fig. 7). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of WRIGHT with the teachings of AZAGURY in order to facilitate preservation of thread identity when executing remote procedure calls (col. 2, lines 32-34).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 16, 2005